

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action notified on February 7, 2005, claims 1-6, 10-13, 15-21 and 25-28 are rejected. Additionally, claim 14 is allowed. Claims 7-9 and 22-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the below-provided remarks. No claims are amended, added or canceled.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's review of and determinations that claims 7-9, 14 and 22-24 recite allowable subject matter. In particular, the Office Action states that claim 14 is allowed. The Office Action also states that claims 7-9 and 22-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

At this time, Applicants choose not to rewrite claims 7-9 and 22-24 in independent form. Instead, Applicants respectfully assert that the pending claims are allowable based on the remarks below.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 15-17, 21 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Yanker (U.S. Pat. No. 5,075,673). Claims 3-5, 11-13, 18-20 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yanker. Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are not anticipated by Yanker or patentable over Yanker for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites in part:

“storing pixels from the input stream into a first set of line buffers, the pixels stored in the first set of line buffers including pixels for the established window size,

prefetching the stored pixels from the first set of line buffers into a second set of line buffers, the second set of line buffers being sufficiently long to store at least the pixels corresponding to the established sampling-window size, and for the video processing stage, fetching the fixed number of pixels from the second set of line buffers” (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is not anticipated by Yanker because Yanker fails to disclose the above-identified limitations of claim 1.

Yanker discloses a world-plane memory (22) and a view port memory (20). (See Fig. 1 and column 2, lines 42-48). However, Yanker fails to disclose that each of the world-plane memory (22) and the view port memory (20) includes a “set of line buffers” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1. Additionally, Yanker discloses that an arithmetic logic unit (ALU) (10) is connected to the world-plane memory (22) and the view port memory (20). (See Fig. 1 and column 2, lines 23-30). However, Yanker fails to disclose that the ALU (10) fetches a fixed number of pixels from the view port memory (20). Thus, Yanker fails to disclose the limitation of “fetching the fixed number of pixels from the second set of line buffers,” as recited in claim 1.

Because Yanker fails to disclose the above-identified limitation of claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is not anticipated by Yanker.

Dependent Claims 2-13

As described above, Applicants appreciate the Examiner’s review of and determinations that claims 7-9 recite allowable subject matter. Additionally, claims 7-9 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 7-9 are also allowable based on an allowable claim 1.

Claims 2-6 and 10-13 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2-6 and 10-13 are also allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1. Additionally, claims 4 and 11 may be allowable for further reasons, as described below.

Claim 4 is dependent on claim 3, which recites in part that “*the window size has X rows and Y columns, and the sampling-window size has X rows, where X is a fixed integer” (emphasis added). Claim 4 recites in part “selecting Y from a set of possible integers” (emphasis added). Claim 11 recites in part that “*the window size has X rows**

and Y columns, where X is a fixed integer and Y is selected to establish the sampling-window size, and wherein the second set of line buffers includes X line buffers for respectively storing X rows of the pixels” (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully assert that Yanker fails to teach the above-identified limitations of claims 4 and 11. In particular, Yanker teaches that a world-plane image (30) may be comprised of 1024x1024 pixels or larger and a viewport (40) may comprise 640 pixels by 480 pixels in the horizontal and vertical directions, respectively. (See Fig. 2 and column 2, lines 60-63). That is, Yanker teaches that the world-plane image (30) and the viewport (40) may have particular sizes, such as 1024x1024 pixels or larger and 640 pixels by 480 pixels in the horizontal and vertical directions. However, Yanker fails to teach that the world-plane image (30) has a fixed-integer number of rows and a flexible number of columns. Yanker also fails to teach that the world-plane image (30) and the viewport (40) have the same number of rows.

Because Yanker fails to teach that the world-plane image (30) has a fixed-integer number of rows and a flexible number of columns and that the world-plane image (30) and the viewport (40) have the same number of rows, Applicants respectfully assert that Yanker fails to teach the above-identified limitations of claims 4 and 11.

Independent Claim 14

As described above, Applicants appreciate the Examiner’s review of and determinations that claim 14 is allowable.

Independent Claim 15

Claim 15 includes similar limitations to claim 1. Because of the similarities between claim 15 and claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that the remarks provided above with regard to claim 1 apply also to claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 15 is not anticipated by Yanker.

Independent Claim 16

Claim 16 includes similar limitations to claim 1. Because of the similarities between claim 16 and claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that the remarks provided

above with regard to claim 1 apply also to claim 16. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 16 is not anticipated by Yanker.

Dependent Claims 17-28

As described above, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's review of and determinations that claims 22-24 recite allowable subject matter. Additionally, claims 22-24 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 16. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 22-24 are also allowable based on an allowable claim 16.

Claims 17-21 and 25-28 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 16. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 17-21 and 25-28 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 16. Additionally, claims 19 and 26 include similar limitations to claims 4 and 11, respectively. Because of the similarities between these claims, Applicants respectfully assert that the remarks provided above with regard to claims 4 and 11 apply also to claims 19 and 26.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Lin et al

Date: April 30, 2009

By: /thomas h. ham/

Thomas H. Ham

Reg. No. 43,654

Wilson & Ham

PMB: 348

2530 Berryessa Road

San Jose, CA 95132

Phone: (925) 249-1300

Fax: (925) 249-0111